
Issue/Focus
The purpose of this article is to describe and analyse the processes and questions surrounding the integration of the Tactical Games Model (TGM; Griffin, Mitchell, & Oslin, 1997; Mitchell, Oslin, & Griffin, 2003) and the Sports Education Model (SEM; Siedentop, 1994). The issues examined include: methods for determining the compatibility of SEM and TGM, key similarities and differences between SEM and TGM, benefits and challenges associated with the integration of SEM and TGM, and the considerations of how to integrate SEM and TGM using a volleyball season.

Reasoning:
The author describes how SEM and TGM are quite compatible and show several similarities, including: the role of play, use of healthy competition, use of learning experiences which represent game experiences, and contributions to the psychomotor domain while including a cognitive component. The author’s research and findings seem to come largely from personal experience, but also includes supporting research by the authors of the SEM and TGM models.

Conclusion:
This article helped show how the older skill-based approach of the SEM model can be effectively integrated with the TGM model to give students a fuller experience in physical education. It also helped emphasize the high level of skill and knowledge required of teachers for integration to be successful.

Significant Information:
The main point to come from this article is that the TGM and SEM models can and should be integrated within a physical education program. Integration is stated as being more beneficial to students and provides a richer sporting experience than what either model could provide on its own.

Personal Comments:
One interesting statement in this article was that teachers need to consider their own capacity for teaching differently before attempting to teach a program using integration of the two models. It suggests that it may be helpful for beginning teachers to first implement SEM and TGM separately before attempting to integrate them.